REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application. Claim 5 has been amended to remove the method limitation objected to by the Examiner.

Claims 1-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Thibeault et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,410,942) in view of *Hata et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,320,209) and *Hayafuji et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,701,321). The applicant traverses this rejection. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The cited references, alone or in combination, do not disclose the display system recited in the claims. Specifically, claim 1 recites a "plurality of semiconductor light-emitting devices embedded in an insulation layer." By embedding the light-emitting device in the insulation layer, numerous advantages, including device formation and heat resistance, are obtained (see specification, pages 15-16). In contrast, *Thibeault* discloses a plurality of light emitting devices that are formed on a spreading layer (20) to spread current to each LED's bottom layer (18) (see FIG. 2, col. 5, lines 17-19). The insulating layer (23) is then deposited over the LED array to insulate each LED from a second spreading layer (24) (col. 5, lines 22-28). Applicant submits that this structure is materially different from the structure claimed in the invention, since none of the aforementioned advantages are present.

It follows that *Thibeault* also does not disclose the LED's having "an exposed upper end portion and a light-emitting region provided between said lower end surface and said upper end portion . . . wherein said light emitting region is at a slant angle relative to said lower end surface" as cited in claim 1. The LED shown in *Thibeault* is not "exposed", since the LED is not embedded in the insulating layer. And as the Examiner noted, *Thibeault* does not teach a light-emitting region having a slant angle relative to the lower end surface.

While *Hata* discloses a triangular LED structure, the LED in *Hata* does not teach an "exposed" upper end portion, which allows the conductor film to contact the upper surface of the insulation layer, along with the upper end portion electrode as claimed in claim 1. *Hayafuji et al.* is also silent on these features.

Furthermore, there is no motivation or suggestion to combine the teaching of *Hata* with *Thibeault* (see MPEP 2143.01). The triangular structure disclosed in *Hata* is expressly used to control the stripe width openings (144) of the conductive growth mask (104) to control current

flow and in turn, the resistance of the active layer (107) of a light-emitting device (col. 5, lines 62-67; col. 6, lines 1-9, 14-22, 41-48). By controlling these resistances, *Hata* teaches that the crystal crack problem mentioned by the Examiner may be alleviated (col. 1, lines 53-67; col. 2, lines 1-14; col. 6, lines 14-22). However, *Thibeault* relies on a totally different structure that uses current spreading layers (20, 24) which renders the cracking problem addressed in *Haga* nugatory (see col. 6, lines 14-23 addressing thermal dissipation). Accordingly, there can be no motivation or suggestion to combine these references.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and submits that claims 1-14 are now in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY _____

Peter Zura
Reg. No. 48,196
P.O. Box 1135
Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135
Phone: (312) 807-4208

Dated: February 17, 2004